



**Fw: Honorable Judge Stuart M. Bernstein - RE: Gawker Case # 16-11700  
(SMB) NOTICE TO COURT OF INTENTIONAL EFFORT TO REMOVE XP  
FROM RECOVERY PROCESS**

**Chantel Barrett** to: nysbml\_caseadmin

12/13/2016 12:45 PM

---

From: XP VEHICLES <legal@xpvehicles.com>  
To: bernstein.chambers@nysb.uscourts.gov  
Date: 12/10/2016 04:42 PM  
Subject: Re: Honorable Judge Stuart M. Bernstein - RE: Gawker Case # 16-11700 (SMB) NOTICE TO  
COURT OF INTENTIONAL EFFORT TO REMOVE XP FROM RECOVERY PROCESS

---

On 12/07/2016 10:45 AM, XP VEHICLES wrote:

XP Vehicles Task Force

Email: [legal@xpvehicles.com](mailto:legal@xpvehicles.com)

**BRANCHES CASE FILES: <http://globalscoop.net/NEXT>**

Alliance of witnesses and victims in  
association with Claimants and

Plaintiffs in pro per

Dec. 10, 2016

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X

:

In re

:

:

1

Gawker Media LLC, et al.,

:

:

Debtors.

:

-----X

Chapter 11

Case No. 16-11700 (SMB)

**NOTICE TO COURT OF INTENTIONAL AND ILLICIT EFFORT TO REMOVE  
XP FROM RECOVERY PROCESS**

XP provides the following notice on record to the court for this case and future iterations of this case.

1. Every Court and legal representative of each and every entity involved in this case was aware of XP's claims against Gawker Media from the previously existing Court Filings in XP V. DOE, The Washington Post Article, The Pacer.gov records, The Fox News articles, The Drudge Report links, letters to Gawker, the recurrence of "XP VEHICLES" when scanning every server owned or managed by Gawker and their handlers, and requests to the parties for restitution. In spite of this knowledge, nobody ever responded to XP to help XP be involved in this case.
2. None of the above parties ever made a single phone call, or responded to our voicemails, to XP to advise of the case initiation or to discuss any aspect of the case or to advise us of options aside from one phone call from a clerk at Prime Clerk.
3. Only one FEDEX was ever received from any party in the case and even that mailing was far late in the game. Even that FEDEX arrived with notifications of court dates that had already passed.
4. No material was received from any party in this case within a reasonable time-frame for an in pro per claimant to 1.) understand the material 2.) draft a response and 3.) transport hard copy material across the entire width of the United States.
5. Time sensitive materials were received by "snail mail" with NO EXPEDITING service. XP, as in in pro per, has been cut out of it's requested rights.
6. FEC, Financial disclosures and intelligence records show that the majority of other parties in this case are financial and quid-pro-quo crony favor-promise backers of Hillary Clinton. Among themselves, it seems that those campaign financiers have assumed, and discussed, the fact that they should use this Gawker bankruptcy proceeding in order to "punish" XP for filing an anti-corruption lawsuit during the Obama Administration and causing Eric Holder, Robert Gibbs, Steven Chu, Lachlan Seward and others to be fired from the U.S. Government for

corruption.

While it is the "*convenience of simple minds*" to assume that anything that disturbs a pre-arranged and illicit scheme must illuminate an enemy; the fact is: That is simply 100% erroneous thinking on the part of those attempting to cut XP out of it's recovery.

XP is a non-political entity focused on building cars for taxpayers.

XP has NO political party affiliation.

XP's sole concern in public policy is to support a strengthened FBI who can finally receive the "go orders" from the White House to arrest and prosecute the Gawker Media entities and their handlers, who attempted to manipulate the election process, hide tax money, rig stocks and bribe officials in order to steer hundreds of billions of taxpayer dollars into their personal pockets.

Today, Prime Clerk posted a clarification filing from Bollea to Williams which sought to clarify misunderstandings. Inspired by this document, XP files this clarification.

7. XP filed, in writing and proved by Prime Clerk, a request to the court for funding to travel to the New York hearings from California. No response was every received from any party.

9. XP filed, in writing and proved by Prime Clerk, a request to the court for "hardship support", legal representation and fair counsel based on extenuating circumstances. No response was every received from any party.

10. The facts prove that Gawker Media and Gawker's associates took extraordinary measures to engage in a large number of actions to seek to damage, destroy, harm, "annihilate", character assassinate and vindictively punish XP, XP's investors and staff on orders from Gawker investors, owners and partners.

11. XP disputes each and every statement seeking to remove XP from it's rights and justice in this case.

12. Eric Holder, Robert Gibbs, Steven Chu, Lachlan Seward and 40 other officials and Solyndra-like entities tried many of the same tactics on XP and it's associates. All parties are urged to consider the fact that "CRIME DOESN'T PAY" and look at what happened to those participants.

13. In the communications docket provided today by Prime Clerk, we do not see a single entity who is not a lawyer? XP is not a lawyer and does not have legal representation for this case. XP has requested, in writing, numerous times, that DOJ or the NY Bar or the court help XP acquire a lawyer or equitable legal representation as a disadvantaged Claimant. No party provided a response to XP except the DOJ dead-end to a local service who is not allowed to participate. How, exactly, is it legal that a Claimant be cut-out of receiving legal aid in a highly visible case such as this unless that Claimant is being intentionally kept away from receiving their legal rights?

14. While billionaires, entire national cabinets, major journalists, the majority of the U.S. Congress, all of the President-Elect's staff who were also damaged by Gawker and most voters "conceptually" and morally support XP's case, none of them give XP any money. Thus XP is placed at a severe legal disadvantage.

How will the Court help XP acquire an equitable position in this case?

XP and Associates